

17115 Old Ave North
Seminole Fla 33540
26 March 58

Editor
Saturday Evening Post

Dear Sir:

David Wise's "Secret" Evidence (April 6) would have been very much more difficult (if not impossible) to write had he not limited himself to a certain few carefully chosen items from the List of Basic Source Materials. Unfortunately the article has now been printed and will be a lasting discredit to the Post. In defense of the Post, the only defense I can think of is that it did not have for itself a copy of the List to which the article referred. It could have been had from the Archivist for \$0.25 in microfilm (or \$37. Xerox).

The List includes "X" marks alongside items which can not be revealed to the public. For a small sampling of items which Wise chose not to include - for the reason that by doing so his article would necessarily have taken on a completely new aspect:

Oswald's tax returns for '56, '58, '62. What is so hush-hush about this? As the Commission's staff made a considerable effort to account for every dollar earned and spent, should they not have welcomed supporting evidence of their findings for publication in the Exhibit volumes?

Timewise with certain Ruby tax returns. Some are published in the Exhibits (Vol. 23), some escape mention, and others are marked "X" (hush-hush) in the List of Basic Source Materials.

Phone call records? The Exhibit volumes are full of them - perhaps a dozen pages or so in the aggregate, primarily relating to Ruby and his friends, relatives, business acquaintances, etc. So then why should the records concerning all of Ruby's several telephones for the critical period of '63, to say nothing of his off-sets, be placed in a separate short list and Classified?

As the List for the most part lists reports without bringing attention to the subject matter contained within the reports, and as I am now thinking about telephone records: One of the numerous "X's" can logically be explained to concern the telephone records of Oswald's 1026 N Beckley Address. Otherwise, one must assume that in the course of this one greatest "investigation" in history nothing happened to think about who the "assassin" was telephoning prior to the assassination. Even lesser figures than Oswald had their phone records (or, rather, the veritable thereof) published in the Exhibits up to and beyond a period of 60 days. But the assassin himself?

Want another example from the List? A report ("X") which tells of the location of a "bone specimen". Presumably the evidence which that bone specimen could provide is so utterly hush-hush that not only are the bone and its photo classified but the location of the photo is guarded information.

Want more? See the List.

2 Editor SEP 26 March 68

Now how could Wise have written his article except by eliminating references to such things as I've mentioned from the list which provided so much of his material? That it was not accidental becomes even more clear when it is seen that he strained to include every item in the list useful to the slant of his article. Example: his reference to "Investigation concerning telephone numbers found on the 47th page of Oswald's address book" - "(CD 971)". If he was not straining, why include this item when Oswald's address book, all pages, has been open for all to read for over three years in vol. 16?

Some good might come of the article, however. Through a stupid, careless slip Wise states "Some months ago the CIA attempted to suppress the list because it contains the titles of 50 secret CIA documents, but by then it was too late. The archives declined to classify a document that had been public for several months." If this did happen, consider the implications of the event. Once the "secret" was out, it was out: therefore any further interest could only be logically directed against its becoming more widespread, ie, in non-intelligence areas. Or, more specifically, amongst the citizenry. An awesome slip, eh? If the article was not provided by you in collaboration with Wise, it appears that you have made a mistake. And if you did prepare the article jointly, then you have made an even greater mistake.

Despite such articles as Wise's (or should I say because of them?) an increasing number of people are coming to realize that the fact of the assassination is relatively less important than a study of the investigation which ensued from it. Today we are asking just Who is running this show? We always used to think it was us, the people who vote.

Straw polls on this are coming into vogue all over the country. A recent radio poll in this area (Tampa Bay area of Florida) shows 82% for reopening of the investigation. How, then, can it come about that no investigation is forthcoming? A penny (1¢) from each of the protestors throughout the nation could provide a million dollar funding for further investigation. Lift a pencil and figure it out for yourself. The cost of this letter (10¢ stamp) would be ten times my share of the burden in a million dollar reopening. If it is neither a money question (clearly ridiculous) nor a voter problem (likewise clearly ridiculous), then what is it?*

*And in view of the seriousness of the issue, how does it come about - how is it possible - that the SEP could still, today, publish such a transparently misleading article?

Yours truly,

Steffen Sorensen
Steffen Sorensen

cc : Numerous, numerous.